

REMARKS

By this amendment, the specification, drawings, and claims 17, 20 and 23 are revised to place this application in condition for allowance.

The specification is revised in the proper manner and Figure 5c has been corrected to be consistent with the original specification disclosure.

Claims 17 and 23 are revised to clarify the configuration of the body and rib.

Pursuant to the telephone discussion of August 4, 2010 between the Examiner and the undersigned, this amendment is being filed in response to the Examiner's request to consider the claims as part of an amendment rather than via a personal interview. Moreover, the revisions to the claims are made with the specific intent to more clearly describe the patentable subject, which is hinted to be present in the Detailed Action, see page 6, the last five lines.

In review, the Examiner has taken the position that Hurley discloses body portions 10 and 12 and a notch as rib 14. Each body portion is alleged to have a load bearing surface.

Claims 17 and 23 are revised to define the body with a longitudinal axis and a single load bearing surface extending along the longitudinal axis, with the body comprising the first and second body portions.

The at least one rib is defined as being perpendicular to the load bearing surface, which is now consistent with the Examiner's observation in this regard.

Applicant submits that Hurley no longer anticipates claims 17 and 23. Even if the Examiner could consider one of the walls 10 or 12 to be the body with the longitudinal

axis and load bearing surface, there are no body portions that have the longitudinal axis and further have a notch between the body portions. The walls 10 and 12 cannot be considered to be the body since they do not have a longitudinal axis that is shared with the load bearing surface. Thus, anticipation does not exist based on Hurley and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Since Hurley and the invention are fundamentally different, one of skill in the art cannot modify Hurley and arrive at the invention.

Further, since the Examiner has indicated that the invention appears to be patentable and the only problem is with the claim language being used to define the invention, this amendment is proper for entry to place the application in condition for allowance.

In addition, if the Examiner believes that further amendments are required to overcome the rejection and in light of the Examiner's request to present the claim proposal as a formal response instead of via an interview, a telephone call to resolve any claim issues would be greatly appreciated.

In light of the above, Applicant submits that claims 17-23 are now in condition for allowance.

Again, reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested.


The above constitutes a complete response to all issues raised in the Office Action dated June 16, 2010.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no fee required for this submission.

Application No.: 10/581,992

However, please charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit
Account No. 50-1088.

Respectfully submitted,
CLARK & BRODY

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Christopher W. Brody", written over a horizontal line.

Christopher W. Brody
Registration No. 33,613

Customer No. 22902
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 510
Alexandria, VA 22314

Telephone: 202-835-1111
Facsimile: 703-504-9415

Docket No.: 12131-0002
Date: August 9, 2010